A1935-21

SURVEY OF THE HISTORICAL PROFESSION

ACADEMIA

1981-82

SUMMARY REPORT

American Historical Association

institutional services program

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
400 A Street SE, Washington, DC 20003

1984 OFFICERS

President:	Arthur S. Link, Princeton University
President-elect:	William H. McNeill, University of Chicago
Executive Director:	Samuel R. Gammon
Editor:	Otto Pflanze, Indiana University
Controller:	James H. Leatherwood

COUNCIL

Arthur S. Link
William H. McNeill

Philip D. Curtin
Samuel R. Gammon, ex officio

Gerhard L. Weinberg, Vice-President
Research Division (1984)
University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill

John A. Garraty, Vice-President
Teaching Division (1985)
Columbia University

Richard S. Kirkendall, Vice-President
Professional Division (1986)
Iowa State University

Elizabeth L. Eisenstein (1984)
University of Michigan
Robert I. Rotberg (1984)
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology
Robert M. Warner (1984)
Archivist of the United States

Joyce O. Appleby, (1985)
University of California,
Los Angeles
Katherine Fischer Drew (1985)
Rice University
Frederic E. Wakeman, Jr. (1985)
University of California,
Berkeley

SURVEY OF THE HISTORICAL PROFESSION

ACADEMIA

1981-82

SUMMARY REPORT

Funded in part by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities

Copyright, American Historical Association, 1984

CONTENTS

List of Tables v
Foreword vii
Introduction ix

PART ONE: Analysis of Data

Description of Data Base 1

Undergraduate Majors 4

Curriculum 5

Department Budgets, Professional Support 11

Salaries and Benefits 20

Tenure, Promotion, Hiring

a. Faculty 27

b. Standards of Promotion 30

Departures from Departments; Nonacademic Employment 33

Gender and Race: Cohort Differences

a. Gender 35

b. Minority Status 38

PART TWO: Survey Results

Section I: Department and Institutional Data 43

II: Salaries and Benefits 45

III: Instructional and Research Support 46

IV: Promotion and Tenure 49

V: Personnel Changes 51

VI: Enrollment and Curriculum 53

VII: Faculty Data 56

VIII: Department Administration 56

IX: Current Issues 57

X: For Graduate Departments Only 60

Appendix

LIST OF TABLES

1a Course Offering in Departments (Undergraduate) 9

1b Rank Orders: Percent of Surveyed Departments Offering Specified Courses 10

2 Dollar Amounts Budgeted for Departments (Mean and Median) During Academic Year 1981-82, for Specified Categories . . 11

3 Percent of Departments Receiving $10,000 or More in Research Funds, 1981-82 by Kinds of Departments 14

4 Research Support for Departmental Faculty, 1981-82 15

5 Research Support for Kinds of Departments from Specified Sources 16

6 Frequency Distribution Among Categoried Pay Levels 20

7 Rank-Orders, with an Order of 1 Signifying the Highest % Salary Increases Over the Previous Year, and the Highest Proportion of Base Salary for Fringe Benefits 22

8 Method for Awarding Salary Increases 23

9 Starting Salaries for new PhDs: Rank-Order, with 1 Signifying the Highest Starting Salary 24

10a Size of Institution by Department Faculty Teaching Load, in Average Classroom Hours Per Week (%) 26

10b Graduate-Degree-Granting Status by Individual Faculty Teaching Load, in Average Classroom Hours Per Week (%) . . 26

11 Frequency Distributions for Faculty Ranks 27

12 Full-Time Faculty Hiring, Fall 1981 (Number) 29

13 Relative Importance of Professional Activities for Promotions: Degree-Granting Status of Departments by Distribution (%) Among Elements of Promotions 31

14 Number of Full-Time Faculty Who Permanently Left Departments in Academic Year 1981-82, or Who Expect to Leave at the End of the Academic Year 34

15 Age of Faculty by Sex 35

16 Cohorts (By Date of Receipt of PhD): Gender by Rank, Tenure Status, and Salary Level 37

17 Cohorts (By Date of Receipt of PhD): Minority Status by Rank, Tenure Status, and Salary Level 39

FOREWORD

In authorizing and sponsoring this survey the Council of the association has adopted a policy of complete confidentiality in the handling and dissemination of data as follows:

> "Response to the survey is voluntary, both in its entirety and in respect to individual items. The association hopes that every department will provide full information. For fifty years after its receipt the association will treat all such information as confidential. The data will be used only for statistical purposes, will be released only in aggregate form, and will not be used to the detriment of any department or individual."

The survey has resulted from a long process of discussion, consultation, and experiment among members of the association, several association committees, particularly the Professional Division and the Committee on Women Historians, the Council and many department heads around the country.

Coordinator
Survey of the Historical Profession
American Historical Association
400 A Street, SE
Washington, DC 20003

INTRODUCTION

In 1980 the American Historical Association (AHA) undertook a survey of departments of history. The results of that survey appeared in Summary Report, Academia, 1980-81, published by the AHA in 1981.

A grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities enabled the AHA to conduct a second survey for the academic year 1981-82. There were two concerns which grew out of the first (1980-81) survey. First, the survey instrument itself had to be simplified. The AHA contracted Polimetrics Laboratory of Ohio State University to complete this task. The 1981-82 survey consisted of 52 questions compared to 68 in the 1980-81 survey. More important, Polimetrics made stylistic and substantive changes in many questions which were intended to aid in obtaining more specific and accurate responses. As a part of its contract with the AHA, Polimetrics also completed a report, entitled "The Departmental Survey as a Data-Gathering Tool for Professional Associations," for distribution to NEH and professional societies.

A second concern involved the response rate to the 1980-81 survey: 462 departments responded out of a total of 1,797 to whom the AHA mailed surveys. Using two mailings in 1982 (one to all departments and a second to nonrespondents four months later) helped improve the 1981-82 response rate by 25%.

The NEH grant stipulated that the AHA should undertake an analysis of the 1981-82 survey results. This analysis appears in **Part I** of the survey report. The survey results are presented in **Part II**. The grant also called for comparisons of data between the 1980-1981 and 1981-82 surveys. This proposed analysis raised several troubling questions. First, the two surveys were not identical, since the second survey form was modified. Second, the statistical reliability of a comparative analysis is hindered by the fact that the two respondent groups are not identical populations. Third, since the significant trends are long-term, comparing two years so closely grouped seemed less meaningful. After discussions with NEH program staff it was agreed that a comparative analysis would have limited utility in light of these problems of statistical reliability.

The AHA wishes to express its appreciation to Polimetrics Laboratory, especially Dr. Kristi Anderson and her staff, for their work in revising the survey form and overseeing the coding and tabulation of data. Dr. Anderson authored "The Departmental Survey as a Data-Gathering Tool for Professional Associations," (Appendix I) and worked closely with the AHA in all phases of the project.

Dr. Charlotte Quinn, former AHA assistant executive director, helped plan the project in its early stages; Dr. Page P. Miller, director of the National Coordinating Committee for the Promotion of History, and Meredith Helleberg of the AHA staff, made valuable suggestions for the improvement of this report. Sammetta P. Banks, also of the AHA staff, served as project administrative assistant.

Jamil S. Zainaldin
Deputy Executive Director
American Historical Association

PART ONE

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY DATA

FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 1981-82

Description of Data Base

In 1982, the AHA sent a departmental survey to 1,797 departments of history in the United States, and Canada. The AHA received 590 responses.

One problem we encountered soon after our mailing was that some departments apparently were no longer in existence or had merged with other departments in an institution and so thought that the survey did not apply to them. Without accurate, up-to-date lists of existing departments in postsecondary institutions, it is difficult to determine the response rate to the AHA survey precisely. A very conservative estimate of the response rate is about 35%. If a department attrition rate of 5% is assumed, the response rate approaches 40%.

Clearly, then, the results of the AHA departmental survey describe only respondent departments. Thus when this report speaks of trends, frequencies, kinds of institutional departments, and so forth, reference is limited to respondents and not to the universe of departments in the field of history in the United States.

Why some departments chose not to respond to the survey is difficult to determine. Certainly the length and complexity of the survey instrument is one consideration. Still, evidence suggests that departments located in certain regions of the country were more

likely to respond to our request for information--independently of the distribution of departments geographically. The response rate was strong in some of the southern, midwestern, and mid-Atlantic states. Reflecting perhaps the distribution of kinds of higher-education institutions, the vast majority of departmental respondents are affiliated with state (267) and private (273) colleges and universities; the remainder are affiliated with county (15) and municipal (10) governments, or are quasi-public (11).* A surprising number of departmental respondents (44%) are part of a joint administrative structure. The most common joint structures were between history and "social science," political science, or government. Almost all of the departments are part of a college or university granting the baccalaureate degree; about one in three grant advanced degrees.

About two-thirds of our respondents are part of educational institutions with total enrollments of less than 2,600. The average size of departments, in terms of full-time equivalent (FTE) positions, is around 10. But this number may be misleading since our respondent population is somewhat split between very small and very large departments. Probably a more statistically descriptive FTE number is between 5 and 6 (the median is 5.5).

Throughout this report, references will be made to departments and institutions. "Departments" refer to the surveyed departments; "institutions" refer to the college or university of which the department is a part. In sections of the analysis, "institutional

*The total does not equal 590, the number of respondents, since 14 departments failed to provide information on affiliation.

size" is used in analyzing survey data. Size is based on total full-time student enrollment at the institution. "Small" refers to enrollments of 5,000 or less, "medium" to enrollments of 5,001-14,999, and "large" to enrollments in excess of 14,999. Survey data is also examined from the perspective of graduate and undergraduate departments. Graduate departments include those granting the MA or PhD degrees in addition to the BA. "Public" or "private" status refer to institutions publicly owned (ordinarily state colleges and universities) or privately owned (private, chartered corporations).

A handful of respondents are affiliated with municipal- or county-owned institutions (25). Because of the smallness of sample size, they are not analyzed in this narrative. However, data on these institutions appear in **Part II** of this report on frequency distribution of responses to survey questions. Finally, data are analyzed according to the geographic location of departments. Geographic regions correspond to the "Election Studies" criteria of the Michigan American National Election Studies.

The narrative report rounds decimal percentage points to the nearest whole number. Thus 27.9% becomes 28%; 27.3% becomes 27%. The decimal point in a percentage is retained in the tables (e.g., 27.9% would be so reported). **Means** and **medians** are used in the narrative and summary data reports. For some responses a **mean** may be the more revealing measure; for others the **median** is more descriptive. The **mean** is an arithmetic average, computed by adding the values of several observations and dividing by the number

of observations. The **mean** is sensitive to extremes in values, and as a result may be skewed. In cases where there are extremes in values the **median** is more useful. The **median** is the value of the "middle" case in a rank-ordered set of observations: half the observations have values below the value for this case, and half have values above. However high or low these values may be, the **median** is not distorted.

Undergraduate Majors

A major concern of the profession, the decline of enrollments in history courses, is reflected in the most common problems cited by department chairs (Q42). Whether controlling for size of institution, graduate or undergraduate degree-granting status, or public or private status, respondents repeatedly expressed concerns about attracting students to their classes, frequently coupled with a concern about declining numbers of majors.

Departments are indeed experiencing some enrollment problems: 20% reported a drop of 5% or more in the number of declared history majors between the previous academic year and the current (1981-82) academic year (Q31). Likewise, 18% of the departments reported a decline of 5% or more in the number of history majors graduated from their departments over the previous academic year (Q33). While the survey identifies the decrease as 5% or more, the problem of some departments approaches an alarming dimension when we consider that enrollment declines may in fact greatly exceed 5%.

On the other hand, the picture changes slightly when the increases in majors are examined: 17% and 13% of the departments respectively reported increases of 5% or more in currently enrolled and graduated majors. The net loss from the previous year, then, is about 3% (enrolled) and 5% (graduated). However, it is misleading to balance enrollment decreases at some institutions with enrollment increases at others to arrive at a net figure. The blunt fact is that many departments have been very hard hit by drops in the number of majors: 18% of the small, 19% of the medium, and 20% of the large institutions have experienced declines. Since 1970, according to the National Center for Education Statistics, the number of BA degrees awarded in history has dropped almost in half (from 43,386 in 1970 to 21,019 in 1979).

It is perhaps worth observing at this point that trends in numbers of majors operate somewhat independently of institutional history course requirements (Q35). That is, an analysis of our data suggests that numbers of majors are not greatly influenced by the existence of college-wide history requirements.

Curriculum

In an ideal world every department of history would like to offer courses that cover major chronological, geographic, and thematic subject matter central to the discipline. It is axiomatic in the profession that ethnocentricity is an inappropriate determinant of what is and is not of historical significance. Thus, we would hope

that college students could pursue their historical interests wherever those interests might lead, be it in Latin America, the United States, or Asia. The realities of departmental existence suggest another axiom: with limited resources for hiring faculty, departments must inevitably specialize, concentrating course offerings more narrowly than they might wish. Student demand and graduation requirements for nonmajors more than likely play key roles.

History faculty members seem sensitive to this point. The narrow range of course offerings in departments, combined with inadequate faculty size, was among the top five departmental problems identified by survey respondents (Q42). Nor is this situation likely to change in the future, if the prospect for creation of new slots in departments is any measure. For the 590 departments surveyed, our data projects the creation of 82 new tenure-track positions in 1981-83.* Obviously, to the extent that curriculum is linked to the availability of faculty, we can expect little change in the comprehensive coverage of curriculum.

*This figure does not include temporary appointments for the years 1981-83. Our best estimate of this figure, for the 590 departments, is 209. Some of these appointments may be replacements for faculty on leave. In terms of new personnel in departments, this would yield about six-tenths of one new person per department for 1981-83.

Turning to curriculum, the survey (Q37) listed eighteen thematic, chronological, and geographical fields of history and asked departments how many courses they offered in the current academic year in each subject area. How adequately history departments cover subject areas will naturally depend on one's perspective.

Not surprisingly, almost all departments offer introductory courses in U.S. and non-U.S. history. The general introductory course in non-U.S. history is offered in 91% of all departments, followed closely by introduction to U.S. history (90%). The mean number of courses offered in each of these areas per department (3.3) during the academic year 1981-82 was the third highest recorded. The third most commonly offered subject area is European history (early modern and modern eras). The next three rankings (rank-ordered 4, 5, and 6) are all U.S. subject areas.

Several interesting frequency profiles emerge in the data--with interest depending once again on perspective. Quantitative history, a field that has witnessed an explosion in scholarly interest in the last two decades, seems firmly established in the curriculum. It is offered in over half of all departments. Public/applied history, another subject area of recent and growing interest in the profession, has yet to establish a curricular identity, ranking last in course offerings (though it may be countered that one in ten departments now offering courses in this new academic area represents an advance). European history ranks exceptionally high: while it ranks third in offerings, as noted above, there are more academic-year

courses offered in this subject (a mean score of 4.9 courses per department per year) than in any other field.

Most thematic course offerings seem to be folded into U.S. history courses (e.g., history of American law). The history of women, like quantitative history, is another area of new scholarship that seems to have a firm hold in the history curriculum: 44% of all departments offer courses in the area. This number would be higher if thematic courses, such as history of the family or childhood, both of which contain women's historical content, were counted for statistical purposes as being primarily women's history. Unfortunately, it is not possible to disaggregate the data in this way. With the exception of Latin America, of which some areas may be categorized as Third World, Third World history courses are among those least offered. (See Table 1.)

TABLE 1

A

Course Offering in Departments (Undergraduate)

	% offering	Median Courses per year	Mean Courses per year
Non-U.S. Introductory	90.7	2.1	3.3
Ancient/Medieval	70.1	1.5	2.4
Europe, early/modern	82.3	2.6	4.9
British/Commonwealth	67.4	1.3	1.7
Islam/Near East/N. African	37.0	.3	.7
Africa, sub-Saharan	28.4	.19	.53
South/S-East Asia	25.4	.17	.45
East Asia	52.7	.6	1.5
Latin America	62.7	1.0	1.5
U.S. basic/introductory	89.8	2.07	3.3
U.S. to 1870	73.0	1.7	2.4
U.S. since 1870	80.2	2.0	2.7
U.S. Thematic	79.7	2.3	3.8
Other U.S. "thematic" courses	53.8	.8	2.0
Science/Medicine/Technology	26.3	.17	.61
Women	44.1	.39	.73
Public/applied history	13.8	.08	.27
Historiography/Quantitative	51.8	.5	.8
Other	31.9	.2	1.1

TABLE 1

B

Rank Orders: Percent of Surveyed Departments Offering Specified Courses

Non-U.S. Introductory	90.7
U.S. basic/introductory	89.8
Europe early/modern	82.3
U.S. since 1870	80.2
U.S. Thematic	79.7
U.S. to 1870	73.0
Ancient/Medieval	70.1
British/Commonwealth	67.4
Latin America	62.7
Other U.S. "thematic" courses	53.8
East Asia	52.7
Historiography/Quantitative	51.8
Women	44.1
Islam/Near East/N. African	37.0
Other	31.9
Africa, sub-Saharan	28.4
Science/Medicine/Technology	26.3
South/S-East Asia	25.4
Public/applied history	13.8

Departmental Budgets, Professional Support

Question 11 of the survey asked departments how they allocated funds among various departmental reponsibilities, duties, and functions. Dollar amounts budgeted, based on means and medians, appear in Table 2:

TABLE 2

Dollar Amounts Budgeted for Departments (Mean and Median) During Academic Year 1981-82, for Specified Categories

	mean	median
Faculty salaries	$251,691	$140,000
Admin/staff/clerical salaries	$ 16,478	$ 8,000
Teaching assistantship and other graduate student support	$ 14,879	$ 1.29
Travel, per diem, etc., for professional meetings	$ 5,546	$ 750
Equipment, postage, supplies; teaching, research materials (other than library acquisition)	$ 9,366	$ 2,400
Other	$ 2,209	$ .16

Of special interest in Table 2 is the great variation between the reported means and medians. This variation reflects sharp deviations in expenditures among departments. That is, some departments budget a large amount of money for some categories (e.g., graduate student assistantships) for which others budget none at all. The median probably is the most representative measure of budgeting by departments in the survey, since this measure tends to cut off extremes at either end of the budgeted-dollar spectrum and emphasizes central tendencies.

If the median is used to analyze budgeting practices, then several conclusions about the majority of our respondents become evident: (1) Most of the budgeted dollars are used to pay faculty salaries. (2) Departments generally have clerical and administrative support, though the amount budgeted for this staff represents about 5% of the mean amount allocated to faculty salaries. From this figure, it would be reasonable to conclude that departments have, at best, bare-bones administrative and clerical support, or about two-thirds of one FTE administrative position for their faculty. (3) The very low median figure for teaching assistantships, $1.29, is a result of factoring nongraduate with graduate programs. If the mean is used in this case, $14,879 per department, support for graduate students comprises about 5% of department budgets. (4) Another sharp deviation between mean and median is evident in equipment and supplies. Based on the median, the equipment and supplies category represents about 1% of departmental budgets. (5) A distressing

(perhaps the most distressing) finding is the amount budgeted to support faculty travel to professional meetings (a median of $750). When this is compared with the far more generous mean ($5,546), one may conclude that some departments offer generous professional support while others offer none at all.

Based on the median dollar amounts allocated within departmental budgets, it may be concluded that the overall financial picture is not one of professional health. Availability of typing support, supplies and equipment for research and teaching, and opportunities to participate in professional meetings are necessary to maintaining the professional vitality of department faculty. Yet departments seem very short of funds in all of these areas. This judgment is to some degree subjective, but it is nevertheless a judgment that departments themselves seem to be rendering. Question 42 of the survey asks for open-ended responses on "the major problems currently facing your department." The second most common response (after enrollment declines) concerns department budgets. By this, it can be surmised, is meant professional support (clerical, supplies, travel) and not simply salaries, since faculty salary level as a "problem" was mentioned specifically in about 3% of all responses.

However, there are other ways of looking at "professional support" which perhaps qualify some of the conclusions made above. While the amount budgeted for faculty travel to professional meetings seems small, 98% of all respondents answered affirmatively to the question "Does your institution ever provide funds for travel to professional meetings?" (Q14). Moreover, about 93% of the respondents

stated that their institutions do grant paid leaves to their faculty, though policies governing leave vary widely (Q15).

Also bearing on professional support is the amount of research support received by faculty during the academic year 1981-82. The average amount of support per department, from all sources, was $21,922 (Q16). The median amount was $3,000, another indication of wide variance among departments. For instance, about one-fourth of all departments received no research support from any source in 1981-82; another quarter received only $300 or less. Table 3 reveals the relatively advantageous position of larger, public, graduate degree-granting programs:

TABLE 3

Percent of Departments Receiving $10,000 or More in Research Funds, 1981-82 by Kinds of Departments

Type of department/ institution	% of departments receiving $10,000 or more in research funds, 1981-82
1. Public	52.0%
2. Private	24.7%
1. Small	18.7%
2. Medium	62.0%
3. Large	88.3%
1. Undergraduate	18.4%
2. Graduate	69.2%

When research support is examined for groups of faculty members, controlling for minority status and gender, the picture becomes very bleak for selective groups, especially minority females, as Table 4 illustrates:

TABLE 4

Research Support for Departmental Faculty, 1981-82

A. Males (Total)		B. Females (Total)	
mean:	$18,933	mean:	$2,984
median:	$ 1,500	median:	$5.25

C. Minority Males		D. Minority Females	
mean:	$565	mean:	$1.22
median:	$ .04	median:	$1.14

Research support can also be analyzed from the perspective of source of support. Most of the research support received by departments in 1981-82 came from within a college or university, and here there was relatively little difference among kinds of departments and institutions. But when sources of support move outside the institution, differences become pronounced. Table 5 suggests that large, public, graduate level institutions attract the bulk of outside support. Stated another way, small institutions, especially those in the private sector, are more dependent on internal institutional

support and presumably are more vulnerable to the vicissitudes of institutional funding priorities. One final note: Funding from the National Endowment for the Humanities (summer stipends, fellowship support, conference support, special project support) has visibly penetrated in the profession across all kinds of departments.

TABLE 5

Research Support for Kinds of Departments from Specified Sources

Type of department/ institution	% of department receiving research support (quantity in dollars unspecified) from particular source
A. From Own College/University	
1. Public	81.1%
2. Private	76.2%
1. Small	69.4%
2. Medium	87.9%
3. Large	96.1%
1. Undergraduate	68.2%
2. Graduate	93.1%

B. Local/State Private Agency

1.	Public	14.0%
2.	Private	14.0%
1.	Small	10.0%
2.	Medium	15.0%
3.	Large	27.6%
1.	Undergraduate	10.4%
2.	Graduate	21.0%

C. Local/State Public Agency

1.	Public	23.3%
2.	Private	11.8%
1.	Small	11.4%
2.	Medium	24.4%
3.	Large	28.6%
1.	Undergraduate	11.0%
2.	Graduate	27.8%

(Table 5 cont'd)

D. National Private Foundation

1. Public	17.1%
2. Private	16.1%
1. Small	10.9%
2. Medium	21.1%
3. Large	29.3%
1. Undergraduate	9.5%
2. Graduate	28.1%

E. National Endowment for the Humanities

1. Public	47.8%
2. Private	29.4%
1. Small	29.2%
2. Medium	50.0%
3. Large	58.4%
1. Undergraduate	29.0%
2. Graduate	52.7%

F. Other Federal Agency

1. Public	17.6%
2. Private	9.1%
1. Small	8.9%
2. Medium	16.3%
3. Large	29.7%
1. Undergraduate	8.5%
2. Graduate	21.9%

Support of faculty, of course, can come in other forms, including recognition for achievement. About one-fourth of the surveyed departments reported that their colleges or universities offer awards (monetary or honorary) for outstanding research and publication (Q18). Of these, two-thirds reported that one or more of their faculty members had received at least one award for outstanding scholarly work during the past five years (Q19). More commonly, institutions recognize distinguished teaching: over half reported that faculty are eligible for teaching awards, and of this proportion, 72% reported that one or more members of the department had received distinguished teaching awards in the last five years. Given that the scholarship and teaching awards are administered college-wide, one is tempted to conclude that the professional achievements of history faculty have been laudable in the face of otherwise adverse conditions of support.

Salaries and Benefits

Faculty salaries comprise about 84% of the mean dollars budgeted for departments. How well are history faculty paid? Like so many questions raised in this analysis, the answer depends on perspective. Two observations should be made at this point: (1) most departments are heavily tenured (the median and mean scores for percentage of department faculty with tenure are, respectively, 84% and 76%), which means that history faculty salaries are weighted toward the high side of the pay scale: and (2) salary should be coupled with benefits to arrive at a "compensation" figure. Table 6 presents simple frequencies for salary, with salary broken down into incremental differences of $3,000:

TABLE 6

Frequency Distribution Among Categoried Pay Levels

Salary Level	Number of Faculty	% Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
under $12,000	115	2.5	2.5
$12,000-14,999	71	1.6	4.1
$15,000-17,999	227	5	9.1
$18,000-20,000	513	11.4	20.5
$21,000-23,999	737	16.3	36.8
$24,000-26,999	721	16	52.8
$27,000-29,999	620	13.7	66.5
$30,000-34,999	752	16.6	83.1
Greater than $34,999	762	16.8	99.9

This distribution reveals that the average annual faculty salary is over $24,000 (almost two-thirds have salaries in excess of $23,999). The survey also showed a mean increase in salary over the previous year of 8%, with a very low standard of deviation (Q12). The survey also measured the value of faculty members' benefits as a percentage of base salary (Q13). Benefits for the entire faculty survey population were 19% (mean and median).

Of course there are significant variations in salary level, percentage increase over the previous year, and benefit package. Looking at types of departments, and using the salary increase and fringe benefit package measures as indices, it is possible to construct a rough rank-ordering for comparing crude compensation levels. The rank-orderings in Table 7 use the categories of geographic location, public and private status, size of institution and degree-granting status.

TABLE 7

Rank-Orders, with an Order of 1 Signifying the Highest % Salary Increases Over the Previous Year, and the Highest Proportion of Base Salary for Fringe Benefits

A. Geographic Location*

As % of Salary Increase	Benefits as % of Salary Base
1. Mountain	1. Mountain
2. Mid-Atlantic	2. Northeast
3. Northeast	3. Border
4. Border	4. Pacific
5. Pacific	5. West North Central
6. West North Central	6. New England
7. New England	7. Solid South
8. Solid South	8. Mid-Atlantic

B. Public-Private Status

1. Private	1. Public
2. Public	2. Private

C. Institution's Size

1. Small	1. Large
2. Medium	2. Medium
3. Large	3. Small

D. Degree Granting

1. Undergraduate and Graduate are equal	1. Graduate
	2. Undergraduate

*Regions have been divided according to "Election Studies" criteria, Michigan American National Election Studies.

Perhaps the most conspicuous finding is that percentage increases in salary tend to vary inversely with strong fringe benefit packages. In institutions where pay increases seem less generous compared to others, benefit packages seem more generous, and vice versa. For example, the second highest annual increases in pay were recorded by the mid-Atlantic departments (second of eight), which also recorded one of the least generous benefit packages (eight of eight). In the case of public-private status and institutional size, the inverse relationship between the two variables is perfectly consistent. All things considered, then, total "compensation" levels probably approach a rough equity across kinds of department and geographic locales.

The survey also asked how percentage increases in salary were determined for individual faculty. The most common methods for determining percentage increase (Table 8) were "across the board" and a base salary increase with a variable merit increase (Q12a):

TABLE 8

Method for Awarding Salary Increases in 1981-82*

Method	% of Departments
An across-the-board percentage	47.5
A base salary increase plus merit steps	33.7
A variable percentage	25.5
As a fixed dollar amount	10.5
Other	8.1

*Some departments checked more than one method; column does not equal 100%

Finally, the survey sought information on starting salaries for "new PhDs" in full-time positions (Q30). The median salary is $17,000. When median scores are adjusted for types of departments, the highest starting salaries are recorded by large institutions, graduate degree-granting programs, and public colleges or universities:

TABLE 9

Starting Salaries for new PhDs: Rank-Orders, with 1 Signifying the Highest Starting Salary

A. Geographic Location

1. Pacific
2. Mountain
3. Solid South
4. Border
5. Northeast
6. Mid-Atlantic
7. West North Central
8. New England

B. Public-Private Status

1. Public
2. Private

C. Size of Institution

1. Large
2. Medium
3. Small

D. Degree-Granting Status

1. Graduate
2. Undergraduate

Perhaps too much can be read into starting salaries, but they do denote a minimum salary level in departments and as such may be a harbinger of future trends in salary. If so, then small colleges, private institutions, and nongraduate degree-granting departments, in terms of salary, may be falling behind other history departments. Unless professional support, research assistance, and other budgeting trends discussed earlier are reversed (see Tables 3 and 5), these departments may be doubly disadvantaged in future years.

The other side of the question of salary is the amount of service, or work, performed for pay. Customarily, faculty work loads are divided into three areas: teaching, research and related activity, and service. One of these three responsibilities, teaching (Q10), can be quantified. On average, full-time faculty spend 11.34 hours per week engaged in classroom teaching. This roughly corresponds to a course load of three in one semester, and four in the other. In reality, teaching loads vary depending on several factors, the most important of which seem to be size of institution and degree-granting status. The heaviest teaching loads, as Table 10 notes, are recorded by faculty in small institutions and in nongraduate degree-granting departments. Almost 75% of the faculty in these departments teach between 11 and 15 classroom hours per week. By contrast, faculty in large institutions and graduate degree-granting departments tend to spend between 6 and 10 hours per week in classrooms.

TABLE 10

A

Size of Institution by Department Faculty Teaching Load, in Average Classroom Hours Per Week (Percentages)

	Weekly Teaching Load				
Size of Institution	5 hours or less	6 - 10 hours	11 - 15 hours	16+ hours	Total
Small	2.4%	20.4%	74.5%	2.7%	100%
Medium	.8%	44.3%	52.6%	2.3%	100%
Large	5.2%	75.3%	19.5%	0 %	100%

B

Graduate Degree-Granting Status by Individual Faculty Teaching Load, in Average Classroom Hours Per Week (Percentage)

	Weekly Teaching Load				
Degree-Granting Status	5 hours or less	6 - 10 hours	11 - 15 hours	16+ hours	Total
Undergraduate	1.5%	20.6%	73.9%	4%	100%
Graduate	4.6%	57.5%	37.9%	0%	100%

Tenure, Promotion, Hiring

a. Faculty. One of the more arresting findings of the survey is the large proportion of history departments, 36%, which are fully tenured. From another perspective, using median scores, 84% of the faculty in history departments have tenure. This top-heavy stratification is reflected in Table 11, which lists frequencies for specified academic ranks (total faculty population in the survey):

TABLE 11

Frequency Distributions for Faculty Ranks

Rank	Absolute Frequency	Adjusted Frequency %	Cumulative Frequency
Professor	2114	45.3	45.3
Associate Professor	1423	30.5	75.8
Assistant Professor	810	17.4	93.1
Instructor	225	4.8	97.9
Lecturer	96	2.1	100
TOTAL	4,668		

The vast majority of faculty in departments are full-time employees (95%). Males comprise 86% of this population, females 14%. For the most part, history faculty can be categorized as nonminority (89%). Most of the minority faculty are Asian American (4%) and Black (3%).

The image projected from these figures is one of very limited growth. According to the survey findings, fewer than 10% of those now occupying academic appointments will retire in the next four years (Q26). The median age of faculty is a surprisingly low 45 years, with the largest clustering occurring in the 35-53 year age group.

Respondents, moreover, reported the creation of only 32 new tenure-track positions which were filled in academic year 1981-82. There were 334 academic appointments of all kinds that same year, of which 138 were permanent or tenure-track appointments. Accounting for the number of faculty who left positions in 1981-82 through retirement, nonrenewal of appointment, or voluntarily (273 persons), this translates into a faculty growth rate of .2% (subtracting recent departures from new entrants, divided by faculty population). Recent hiring, in short, is more indicative of replacement activity than real growth in numbers (Q27, 28).

The bulk of new hiring is in temporary, nontenure-track positions, as Table 12 shows. Of the four kinds of appointments noted, the largest numbers were generated in the nontenure-track category. In each category, with one exception, nonminority males outnumbered nonminority females by a factor of two to one. Nonminority appointments outnumbered minority appointments by a factor of about ten to one in temporary appointments, and by a factor of about five to one in permanent-line positions.

TABLE 12

Full-Time Faculty Hiring, Fall 1981
(Number)

	Nonminority		Minority	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
To fill new tenured or tenure-track positions	19	7	4	2
To fill existing tenured or tenure-track positions	57	32	10	7
To fill tenured or tenure-track position vacated by faculty on temporary leave	51	26	3	1
To fill a nontenure-track position	70	36	3	6

While new hirings illustrate distributions of sex and race long present and recognized in the profession,* the nature of that distribution seems to be changing dramatically. If current hiring trends can be projected into the future, the proportion of women in the departments surveyed should increase from its present 14% to about 35%. This is still less than the proportion of women in the graduate student population, or 41% based on the survey data (Q48, 49). Minority hiring is more closely aligned with the proportion of minorities in the graduate student population (about 10%) for temporary appointments; minority hiring in permanent positions is about twice this rate.

*See AHA Guidelines on Hiring Women Historians in Academia, 1981.

Another way of looking at the composition of faculty is through years at their current institutions. While the make-up of faculty, from the perspective of gender and race, is in a transitional period, faculty geographical mobility is likely to change little. On average, faculty have been working for their institutions for 13 years. About 35% of all faculty have been at the same institution for 15 or more years. We can also expect very limited upward mobility in terms of rank. The median years in rank is 6. But when it is considered that between 70% and 80% of the faculty in each department surveyed is tenured, and that the "tenuring" of departments is a relatively recent phenomenon (corresponding with the surge of PhD output and hiring in the 1960s and early 1970s), it is likely that years in rank will climb meteorically in the coming decades. There is, in short, almost nowhere else to go on the academic ladder. As Table 11 (on faculty rank) notes, almost half of all faculty in the survey are full professors.

b. Standards of Promotion. The survey contains questions on standards for awarding tenure and salary increases (Q20,21). The customary rule for evaluating faculty for promotion is generally assumed to be based on quality of scholarship (1/3), teaching (1/3), and service (1/3). The median scores generated in the survey suggest in fact a much greater emphasis on teaching. The relative weight for promotion for each is: scholarship, 25%; teaching, 50%; service, 19%; and other, 5%. The importance of each for awarding salary increases differs principally in credit given to "other" (15%).

Departments are about evenly split on whether or not they have basic expectations regarding the quality and quantity of a candidate's scholarship for the award of tenure (Q23). Of those who do have implicit or explicit expectations, about half expect a candidate to have one or two published (or accepted for publication) articles, with more anticipated. Another 27% require a published and reviewed book, with other articles and projects in progress (Q24).

The relative importance of scholarship in the award of tenure is most likely to vary depending on degree-granting status. Departments that grant advanced degrees place much heavier emphasis on a faculty member's scholarship, both for promotion and salary purposes. Nongraduate degree-granting departments, while also recognizing scholarship, tend to place emphasis on teaching. (Table 13).

TABLE 13

Relative Importance of Professional Activities for Promotions: Degree-Granting Status of Departments by Distribution (%) Among Elements of Promotions

Degree-Granting Status of Departments

A. % Importance of Scholarship

	0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	Total
Undergraduate	31%	22%	25%	14%	5%	2%	0%	1%	100%
Graduate	10%	7%	17%	27%	21%	7%	5%	6%	100%

(Table 13 cont'd)

B. % Importance of Teaching

	0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71+%	Total
Undergraduate	6%	2%	4%	14%	25%	17%	11%	21%	100%
Graduate	3%	5%	24%	27%	24%	8%	5%	4%	100%

C. % Importance of Service

	0-10%	11-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%	51-60%	61-70%	71+%	Total
Undergraduate	51%	26%	13%	4%	2%	0%	1%	3%	100%
Graduate	39%	33%	17%	9%	1%	0%	0%	1%	100%

The point to be made, perhaps, is that the majority of departments do have expectations of scholarship for promotion, with the priority of scholarship varying along lines of degree-granting status.

Departures from Departments: Nonacademic Employment

The surveyed departments reported 334 new academic appointments in 1981-82, and 273 actual (or imminent) departures. It was noted above that new appointments tended to be in nontenure-track positions (Table 12). Likewise, departures from departments tended to be for nonrenewal, or termination, of nontenure-track appointments. Almost one-third of all departures fall into this category. Approximately one-tenth of all departures were for reasons of nonrenewal of tenure-track appointments or denial of tenure. Retirement (27%) was the second most common reason for departure (Table 14).

A question might be raised whether the trends in departures, broken down by race and gender, will offset the projected increases in new hirings for both groups observed earlier. That is, are women and minorities disproportionately represented in the departures? The answer seems to be no. Indeed, emphasizing again that the data applies only to responding departments, women and minorities are more heavily represented both in absolute numbers, and proportionately, in new entrants than they are in recent departures (Q27).

TABLE 14

Number of Full-Time Faculty Who Permanently Left Departments in Academic Year 1981-82, or Who Expect to Leave at the End of the Academic Year

Reason for Leaving	Nonminority		Minority	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Denied tenure	15	4	3	2
Tenure-track appointment not renewed	5	2	0	0
Nontenure-track appointment ended, not renewed	62	22	2	1
Voluntary resignation for history position elsewhere	25	6	5	1
Retirement	68	4	0	1
Voluntary resignation for other personal reasons	17	8	1	2
Deceased	12	2	3	0

To summarize, if current hiring trends (nonrenewable, nontenured appointments) and departure patterns persist, history departments in the future can expect to become largely frozen at the tenure level (in terms of rank and personnel) with a revolving door for younger faculty. The future of this "gypsy" population is of grave concern. When it is considered that the victims of endless strings of nonrenewable appointments tend to be recent PhD graduates, the concern properly goes to the heart of the profession's future health.

One response of younger history PhDs has been to seek work outside the academy. Question 51 of the survey asks departments to make estimates (or provide data) regarding "fields of employment of persons awarded PhDs in the last five years." Colleges or universities employed 57% of the PhD recipients. Government agencies (8%), business and industry (9%), and nonprofit organizations (8%) accounted for 25% of PhD recipients. About 9% are employed by "other," and 9% are listed as unemployed. Academic employment clearly is no longer the primary career path of new history PhDs. While college/university employment still is the single most common occupational path, the employment picture of recent PhD graduates is one of diversity.

Gender and Minority Status: Cohort Differences

a. Gender. Men significantly outnumbered women in the surveyed departments, 86% compared to 14%. Men also are more likely to hold full professorships, occupy tenured or tenure-track positions, have longer years in rank and in institution, and higher salaries. Some of these differences can be explained by the fact that women as a population are younger, as Table 15 notes. They are more recent entrants in the profession and thus occupy more junior faculty positions.

TABLE 15

Age of Faculty by Sex

	20-35 yrs	36-45 yrs	46-55 yrs	56 + yrs
Men	9.3%	33.9%	29 %	27.8%
Women	21.8%	38.5%	17.7%	22.1%

Age is only part of the explanation. When faculty are grouped by when they received their PhDs, differences in status and income persist, suggesting that gender itself is the primary differential. Table 16 consists of five cohorts: men and women who received their PhDs before 1963, between 1963-67, 1968-72, 1973-77, and 1978-82. Rank, tenure status, and income are based on the reported 1981-82 data. These findings suggest that within each cohort, men tend to attain full professorships more quickly than women; with a few exceptions, are more likely to occupy tenured and tenure-track positions; and are more heavily represented in the $24,000+ income group. The largest differentials are registered between men and women who received their PhDs between 1978-82, a sobering and even surprising development in light of the positive gains made by women observed earlier.

TABLE 16

Cohorts (By Date of Receipt of PhD): Gender by Rank, Tenure Status, and Salary Level

Faculty Status and Salary	% To 1962 Men	% To 1962 Women	% 1963-67 Men	% 1963-67 Women	% 1968-72 Men	% 1968-72 Women	% 1973-77 Men	% 1973-77 Women	% 1978-82 Men	% 1978-82 Women
Rank										
Full	69.7	58.6	39.2	32.7	39.2	22.7	10.5	7.1	28.5	9.7
Associate	7.7	9.3	28.2	36.2	53.9	55.4	51.1	41.8	23.5	16.3
Assistant	.6	1.9	1.7	3.4	4.9	10.9	35.4	45.4	30.7	48.4
Tenure Status										
Tenured	98.7	100	98.6	88.1	95	88.8	65.5	48.6	65.7	39.1
Tenure-Track	.5	0	.6	8.5	2	7.1	28.3	39.3	17.9	34.2
Nontenure-Track	.8	0	.8	3.4	3.4	4.1	6.2	12.1	16.4	26.7
Salary										
$30,000+	73.6	64.8	47.4	29.8	20.1	18	8.9	7.2	25.6	9.9
$24,000-29,999	20.3	16.7	40.3	40.4	48.3	39	25.8	19.4	23.8	9.9
$18,000-23,999	4.8	11.2	11.3	29.9	29.7	38	57.1	57.6	32.9	40.3
under $18,000	1.3	7.5	1.1	0	1.8	5	8.3	15.9	17.6	39.9

b. Minority Status. Of the 4,511 faculty who compose the departments surveyed, 388 (9%) include members of a minority group (Blacks, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans). The majority of minority faculty are male (81%). The average age of minority faculty is 41 years, compared to an average age of 47 years for nonminority faculty. Minorities are also more likely to have fewer years in rank and in institution, less senior academic appointments, and a lower mean salary.

As in the case of women, some of these differences can be explained by age. But the degree of difference seems less pronounced. For example, about 4 percentage points separate the proportion of minorities and nonminorities in the $30,000+ salary bracket (29% versus 33%). For women and men, on the other hand, the percentage point difference is much greater (17% versus 36%).

Table 17 examines rank, tenure status and salary levels for minorities and nonminorities grouped into five cohorts based on year of receipt of PhD. Nonminority males in every cohort are more heavily represented in the full professor rank, though the difference is slight; in the 1963-77 cohorts, minorities have a slight advantage in their proportional representation in the highest salary bracket: parity exists in tenured status for the cohorts to 1972, after which period nonminorities gain a decided advantage.

A trend observed among women in the 1978-82 cohort reappears among minorities: current inequities seem greatest among the most recent PhD recipients, with men and nonminorities on a "faster track" in terms of tenure status, promotion, and salary level.

TABLE 17

Cohorts (By Date of Receipt of PhD):

Minority Status by Rank, Tenure Status, and Salary Level

Faculty Status and Salary	% To 1962		% 1963-67		% 1968-72		% 1973-77		% 1978-82	
	Minority	Nonminority	Minority	Nonminority	Minority	Nonminority	Minority	Nonminority	Minority	Nonminority
Rank										
Full	90.3	90.8	63.8	69.2	30.8	39.2	4.8	10.4	17.8	25
Associate	4.8	8.3	29.8	28.6	64.6	52.9	48.4	48.4	17.1	21.9
Assistant	3.2	.5	6.4	1.6	1.5	6	45.2	37.4	39.5	34.4
Other	1.6	.3	[illegible]	.7	3	1.9	1.6	3.9	25.6	18.6
Tenure Status										
Tenured	98.4	98.8	95.7	97.8	96.9	93.7	50	62.5	49.3	60.8
Tenure-Track	0	.5	4.3	1.1	1.6	2.8	46.8	29.2	33.1	20.4
Nontenure-Track	1.6	.7	0	1.1	1.6	3.5	3.2	8.3	17.6	18.9
Salary										
$30,000+	62	73.9	47.7	44.4	25.8	18	10.5	6.1	20.3	21.1
$24,000-29,999	24	19.8	43.2	41	50	47.7	28	24	16.2	21.8
$18,000-23,999	12	4.7	9.1	13.4	22.6	31.8	57.9	58.8	36.5	34.3
under $18,000	2	1.7	0	1.2	1.6	2.4	3.5	11.2	27	22.8

PART TWO: Survey Results

	Questions
Departmental and Institutional Data	1 - 10
Salaries and Benefits	11 - 13
Instructional and Research Support	14 - 19
Promotion and Tenure	20 - 25
Personnel Changes	26 - 30
Enrollment and Curriculum	31 - 37
Department Administration	38 - 41
Current Issues	42 - 45a
For Graduate Department Only	46 - 52

Section I: Departmental and Institutional Data

1. In what state is your college/university located?

   (This information is available upon request.)

2. Is your college/university state, county, municipal, private, or mixed?

		%	N
1.	State	46.4	267
2.	County	2.6	15
3.	Municipal	1.7	10
4.	Private	47.4	273
5.	Mixed: public and private	1.9	11

3. What is the approximate total full-time enrollment of your institution for the current academic year?

		%	N
1.	Under 2,500	47.2	278
2.	2,500 - 5,000	17.0	100
3.	5,001 - 9,999	15.3	90
4.	10,000 - 14,999	7.0	41
5.	15,000 - 19,999	5.4	32
6.	More than 20,000	8.1	48

4. Is the history program at your institution a separate department, or is it part of a joint department or division?

		%	N
1.	Separate	55.4	326
2.	Joint	42.9	252
3.	Other (Specify): _____	1.7	10

4a. (IF JOINT) With what other discipline(s) is history combined to form the joint department or division?

		%	N
1.	Political Science/Government	22.8	60
2.	Social Science	9.9	26
3.	More than one	63.9	168
4.	Other (Specify): _____	3.4	9

5. Does your institution presently grant the following degrees in history?

	YES %	YES N
1. AA	17	93
2. BA/BS	82.7	478
3. MA	35.6	197
4. MAT	9.9	53
5. PhD	17.2	93
6. Professional Certificate	7	37

6. Do you expect your institution to add or drop any history degrees in the next two years?

	%	N
1. Expect to add degree(s)	3.1	18
2. Expect to drop degree(s)	2.4	14
3. Expect no change	94.5	553

6a. (IF EXPECT TO ADD OR DROP DEGREES) Which of the following history degrees do you expect your institution to add or drop in the next two years? (FOR EACH DEGREE, CIRCLE THE NUMBER OF THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.)

	N Add	N Drop
1. BA	4	9
2. MA	8	8
3. PhD	2	5
4. Other (Specify):	4	8

7. What is the current number of FTE (full-time equivalent) history positions in your department with the rank of instructor or above? (ROUND TO WHOLE NUMBERS PLEASE.)

	%	N
1-5 FTEs	49.7	290
6-10 FTEs	18.9	110
11-15 FTEs	8.6	50
16-20 FTEs	9.2	54
21-25 FTEs	6.7	39
26+ FTEs	6.9	40

Median: 9.8 Mean: 5.5

8. Does your department use a clerical pool or do you have your own staff?

	%	N
1. Use clerical pool	41.2	233
2. Have own staff	58.8	332

9. What is the total number of FTEs (administrative, clerical, typing help, etc.) staffing your department during the current year? (ROUND TO WHOLE NUMBERS PLEASE)

Median: 1.4 Mean: 3.2 N = 556

10. What is the average full-time teaching load for your department faculty, that is, the average of classroom hours per week?

hours per week	%	N
less than 9	13.3	77
9 - 11	23.7	138
12 - 14	45.6	265
15+	17.4	101

Median: 11.8 hrs. Mean: 11.34 hrs.

SECTION II: Salaries and benefits

11. What has been the dollar amount budgeted for your department during the current year for the following categories?

	mean	median
1. Faculty salaries	$251,691	140,000
2. Administrative/staff/clerical salaries	$ 16,478	8,000
3. Teaching assistantships and other graduate student support	$ 14,879	1.29
4. Travel, per diem, etc., for professional meetings	$ 5,546	750
5. Equipment, supplies, phone, postage, teaching/research (other than library acquisitions)	$ 9,366	2,400
6. Other (Specify): _____	$ 2,209	.16
	$300,169	151,151

N = 535

12. What was the average percentage increase in history faculty salaries for the current academic year from the previous year (for those faculty who were employed in the previous year)?

Median: 7.79% increase Mean: 8.01% increase N = 559

12a. How was this increase primarily defined? (CIRCLE 1 (YES) OR 2 (NO) FOR EACH TYPE OF INCREASE)

	YES		NO	
	%	N	%	N
1. As a fixed dollar amount	10.5	57	89.5	486
2. As across-the-board percentage	47.5	258	52.5	285
3. A variable percentage	25.5	139	74.5	407
4. A base salary increase plus merit steps	33.7	183	66.3	360
5. Other (Specify): _____	8.1	43	91.9	488

13. On the average, how do the values of faculty members' fringe benefits compare to their base salaries?

Example: For a faculty member receiving a $20,000 salary and fringe benefits valued at $5,000, the benefits amount to 25% of the value of the salary.

Benefits average as % of base salary.

Median: 19.2 Mean: 18.7 N = 465

Section III: Instructional and Research Support

14. Does your institution ever provide funds for travel to professional meetings?

	%	N
1. Yes	98.1	573
2. No	1.9	11

15. Which one of the following policies for paid leaves most accurately corresponds to the conditions applicable to your department faculty?

	%	N
1. Leave available only upon approval of a proposal	38.2	217
2. No specific proposal required for leave (as in traditional sabbaticals)	6.9	39
3. Uncertain availability in a given case; awards are competitive: total numbers in department or institution are limited; depends on proposal	26.9	153
4. Available on request (subject to limits of frequency-traditional policy)	15	85
5. No paid leaves	13	74

16. Indicate the approximate total amount of funds from all sources for research and/or for professional improvement received by history faculty during the current academic year plus summer (include paid leaves/sabbaticals). (Foreign nationals should not be counted as minority.)

	Mean	Median
1. Faculty total	$ 21,922	$ 3,000
2. Male faculty total	$ 18,933	$ 1,501
3. Female faculty total	$ 2,984	$ 5.25
4. Minority male total*	$ 565	$ .04
5. Minority female total*	$ 364	$ 1.80

N = 460

17. Indicate which (if any) of the sources listed below provide funds for research or professional improvement by history faculty during the current academic year plus summer. (CIRCLE 1 (YES) OR 2 (NO) FOR EACH SOURCE.)

	YES		NO	
	%	N	%	N
College or university	77.2	426	22.8	126
Local/state private agency	14.2	78	85.8	472
Local/state public agency	16.7	92	83.3	459
Foreign source (public or private)	8.9	49	91.1	500
National Endowment for the Humanities	37.9	209	62.1	342
Committee on International Exchange of Scholars	4.2	23	95.8	527
Other Federal source (Specify):_____	13.4	73	86.6	473
National private foundation (Specify):_____	15.7	86	84.3	461

18. Does your college/university offer major awards (either monetary or honorary) to faculty for outstanding research or publication?

YES		NO	
%	N	%	N
23.6	137	76.4	444

18a. (IF YES) How many members of your department have received major awards for outstanding research or publication over the past five years?

62.9% of the departments had 1 or more faculty awards.

N = 107

19. Does your college/university offer awards (either monetary or honorary) to faculty for outstanding teaching?

YES		NO	
%	N	%	N
58.6	342	41.4	242

19a. (IF YES) How many members of your department have received awards for outstanding teaching over the past five years?

71.9% of the departments had 1 or more faculty awards.

N = 238

Section IV: Promotion and Tenure

20. Indicate the relative importance of the following kinds of professional activities for departmental decisions regarding promotions.

	Median	Mean
Scholarship	25.5 %	28.7%
Teaching	49.8 %	48.9%
Service	19.5 %	19.3%
Other (Specify):_____	.05%	2.6%

N = 534

21. Indicate the relative importance of the following kinds of professional activities for departmental decisions regarding salary increases.

	Median	Mean
Scholarship	24.9	25.1
Teaching	44.5	41.8
Service	15.5	17.4
Other (Specify):	10	10.4

N = 448

22. Does your institution offer tenure?

	%	N
1. Yes	93.1	543
2. No	6.9	40

23. (IF YES) When making decisions regarding tenure, the quality of a faculty member's scholarship is generally considered to be an important criterion. Other criteria for tenure decisions may include quantity and type of scholarship. Does your department have basic expectations (either explicit or implicit) regarding quantity and type of scholarship which are used as criteria in making tenure decisions?

	%	N
1. Yes	55.1	293
2. No	44.9	239

24. (IF YES) Which one of the following comes closest to describing the basic expectations concerning quantity and type of scholarship used as criteria in tenure decisions for your department?

	%	N
1. Some projects in manuscript; no publication: none anticipated	9.2	29
2. One or two articles published or accepted for publication; more anticipated	47.5	149
3. A book published and reviewed; at least one or two articles published; other projects under way	27.4	86
4. Other (Specify):_____	15.9	50

25. What percentage of your faculty (i.e., FTEs with rank of instructor or above) currently has tenure?

35.8% of the departments are fully tenured.

Median: 84% Mean: 76.8%

N = 553

Section V: Personnel changes

26. How many full-time faculty (in each of the following categories) can be expected to retire in the four years following the current academic year? (Foreign nationals should not be counted as minority.)

	N
Nonminority men	464
Nonminority women	72
Minority men	16
Minority women	10

27. For your faculty as a whole and for each of the four categories: men, women, minority men and minority women, indicate the number of full-time faculty who permanently left the department during the current academic year, or who will have left at the end of the current academic year for the reasons listed below.

	Total Faculty	Nonminority Men	Nonminority Women	Minority Men	Minority Women	% of Total Kinds of Departures
Denied tenure	24	15	4	3	2	8.8%
Tenure-track appointment not renewed	7	5	2	0	0	2.6%
Nontenure-track appointment ended, not renewed	87	62	22	2	1	31.9%
Voluntary resignation for history position elsewhere	37	25	6	5	1	13.5%
Retirement	73	68	4	0	1	26.8%
Voluntary resignation for other personal reasons	28	17	8	1	2	10.2%
Deceased	17	12	2	3	0	6.2%

TOTAL: 273

28. For each of the categories listed below, indicate the number of full-time faculty hired at the start of the current academic year.

	Nonminority		Minority		% of Total Kinds of Departures
	Men	Women	Men	Women	
To fill new tenured or tenure-track positions	19	7	4	2	9.6
To fill existing tenure-track positions	57	32	10	7	31.8
To fill a tenured or tenure-track position vacated by faculty on temporary leave	51	26	3	1	24.2
To fill a nontenure-track position	70	36	3	6	34.4

TOTAL: 334

29. Indicate the number of full-time faculty you have hired or expect to hire for the next academic year.

	Nonminority		Minority		% of Total Kinds of Departures
	Men	Women	Men	Women	
To fill new tenured or tenure-track positions	26	13	4	7	19.5
To fill existing tenured or tenure-track positions	36	22	7	8	28.5
To fill a tenured or tenure-track position vacated by faculty on temporary leave	24	12	3	3	16.4
To fill a nontenure-track position	55	23	7	6	35.5

TOTAL: 256

30. Assuming you were to hire a new faculty member for next year who had no previous full-time teaching experience, what would his or her salary be approximately?

	Mean	Median
For person with PhD degree	$ 16,808	$ 17,000
For person with all graduate work, except dissertation completed	$ 12,073	$ 14,502
For person with qualifications less than above	$ 6,804	$ .47

N = 522

Section VI: Enrollment and Curriculum

31. Did the number of undergraduate history majors increase by 5% or more, decrease by 5% or more or remain about the same between the previous academic year and the current academic year.

	%	N
1. increased by 5% or more	17.2	93
2. decreased by 5% or more	20.5	111
3. remained about the same	62.3	337

32. Indicate the number of undergraduate majors enrolled in your history program and the (approximate or estimated) number of undergraduate degrees in history to be awarded for the current academic year.

	Median	Mean
undergraduate majors	37	59
undergraduate degrees awarded	10	20

33. Did the number of undergraduate degrees in history awarded by your department increase by 5% or more, decrease by 5% or more, or remain about the same between the previous academic year and the current academic year?

	%	N
1. increased by 5% or more	12.7	64
2. decreased by 5% or more	18.5	93
3. remained about the same	68.8	347

34. What was the total enrollment in September 1981 in all history courses?

Median: 480 Mean: 923

35. In order to graduate from your institution, must an undergraduate take at least one history course?

	%	No.
1. Yes	41.7	236
2. No	58.3	330

36. If your department has definite plans to eliminate or to expand areas of study of programs in the next two or three years (e.g., Southeast Asia; quantitative history, archival training) please describe these plans (briefly) below.

(This information is available upon request.)

37. Please indicate the number of different course offerings (not number of classroom sessions) in your history program by fields. Count a 2-semester course as 2 courses; a 3-quarter course as 3 courses.

	Course Offerings in the Current Academic Year				
	Undergraduate		Number of Graduate Courses*	% of departments offering courses in area	N
	Median	Mean			
General Introductory (Western Civ., World Civ., etc.)	2.1	3.4	6	90.7	518
Ancient/medieval	1.5	2.4	89	70.1	89
Europe, early mod/modern	2.6	5.0	146	82.3	470
British/Commonwealth	1.3	1.8	94	67.4	385
Islam/Near East/N. African	.3	.7	49	37	211
Sub-Saharan Africa	.2	.53	30	28.4	162
South/S-East Asia	.17	.4	29	25.4	145
East Asia	.6	1.5	68	52.7	301
Latin America	1.0	1.6	94	62.7	358
U.S. basic/intro	2.1	3.3	12	89.8	512
U.S. 17th, 18th, and early 19th century	1.7	2.4	127	73	417
U.S. late 19th and 20th century	2.0	2.7	139	80.2	458
Other U.S. "thematic" courses	2.3	3.8	102	79.7	455
Other "thematic" courses (not specific to U.S.)	.8	2.0	72	53.8	307
Science/Medicine/Technology	.28	.61	34	26.3	150
Women	.4	.7	39	44.1	252
Public/applied history**	.08	.3	47	13.8	79
Historiography/Quantitative	.5	.8	128	51.8	296
Other (Specify):_____	.2	1.1	50	31.9	182

* Figures are statistically insignificant when factored with undergraduate programs.
**Cultural resources management; preservation; archives; editing; public policy; etc.

Section VII: Faculty data

(See narrative analysis.)

Section VIII: Department Administration

38. How many members of your history faculty are devoting half-time or more to administrative duties in the department or in the college/university as a part of their formal workload during the current academic year?

Median: .6 Mean: .9 N = 564

39. What kind of appointment does the department chair hold?

		%	N
1.	rotating	8.0	41
2.	one-year	2.4	12
3.	two-year	6.5	33
4.	three-year	35.9	183
5.	indefinite	47.3	241

40. How is the department chair compensated for administrative duties?

		%	N
1.	extra salary	12.3	68
2.	course load reduction	32.4	179
3.	no compensation	18.1	100
4.	other (specify):	2.7	15
5.	combination of course load reduction and extra salary	34.4	190

41. How many FTE staff have as their sole responsibility support of chair activities?

Median: .25 Mean: 3.4

Section IX: Current Issues

42. In your opinion, what is the major problem currently facing your department?

		% of departments identifying subject areas as a "problem"
1.	Enrollment drops (declining enrollment)	22.9
2.	Budgetary problems	9.0
3.	Lack of majors	8.0
4.	Inadequate faculty size (staffing)	7.5
5.	Declining interest in history (students want "practical" majors)	4.1
6.	Lack of funding for professional activities	3.2
7.	Salary increases needed	2.9
8.	Problems with tenure	1.9
9.	Inadequate, unprepared students	1.7
10.	Teacher-student ratio	1.5
11.	Lack of courses in some specific areas	1.4
12.	Not enough research	1.2
13.	Advanced ages of faculty	1.0
14.	Decreasing staff morale	1.0
15.	Survival in general	1.0
16.	Personal problems (cooperation, working relations)	.8
17.	Quality of teaching	.8
18.	Course development	.7
19.	Failure to have history requirement in undergraduate program	.7

20.	Inadequate library resources	.7
21.	Job outlook is bleak	.7
22.	Program validity (inadequate)	.7
23.	Stagnation	.7
24.	Student recruitment	.7
25.	Lack of expertise in some specific areas	.5
26.	Separation of history (want it independent of other disciplines)	.5
27.	Staff reduction	.5
28.	Uncertain future of graduate program	.5
29.	Weak leadership	.5
30.	Low enrollment in upper-level courses	.3
31.	Student loans	.3
32.	Academic freedom	.2
33.	Creating useful graduate and postgraduate programs	.2
34.	Improving basic skills of students	.2
35.	Inadequate travel, staff support, and supply funds	.2
36.	Replacement of current faculty	.2
37.	Selection procedure for chairperson	.2
38.	Wide range of student abilities	.2
39.	Inability to offer more	.0
	Don't know (missing)	15.3
	Other	4.9
	None	.7

N = 500

43. Approximately what proportion of your department's faculty, as far as you know, do paid consulting outside the university?

		%	N
1.	none	59.3	326
2.	less than half	35.8	197
3.	about half	2.7	15
4.	more than half	.5	3
5.	all or almost all	1.6	9

44. Would you say that most of the faculty in your department, if asked, would describe themselves as humanists, as social scientists, as both, or as neither?

		%	N
1.	humanists	55.8	311
2.	social scientists	12.9	72
3.	both	27.5	153
4.	neither	1.8	10
5.	other	.9	5
8.	don't know	1.1	6

45. Have you found the AHA Guidelines on Hiring Women Historians in Academia useful?

		%	N
1.	yes	24.7	146
2.	no	30.3	179
8.	don't know	44.9	265

45a. (IF YES) Has your department accepted the hiring goals enumerated in these guidelines?

		%	N
1.	yes	22.5	133
2.	no	12.4	73
8.	don't know	65.1	384

Section X: For Graduate Departments ONLY

46. Please indicate the current numbers of graduate students studying for graduate history degrees in your department, according to their primary graduate specialty as represented approximately by the following fields. Do not classify a student in more than one primary field.

	%	N
Ancient/byzantine	2.4	149
Europe, medieval	3.8	239
Europe, early modern	6.9	428
Europe, since 1815	13	816
Britain	3.7	231
Islam	1.2	75
Africa	1.5	93
Asia	3.5	216
Latin America	4.5	283
U.S. colonial	7.8	485
U.S. 1770-1870	11.3	703
U.S. since 1870	19.9	1,244
U.S. minorities	1.5	92
Women	2.2	139
Science/Medicine	1.2	74
Diplomacy/Relations	2.4	150
Economic History	1.1	71
Intellectual History	2.8	177
Other:	9.1	568

N = 6,233

46a. Did the number of graduate enrollments (majoring in history) increase by 5% or more, decrease by 5% or more, or remain about the same between the last academic year and the current academic year?

	%	N
1. increase by 5% or more	15.8	28
2. decrease by 5% or more	25.4	45
3. remain about the same	58.8	104

47. How many Masters and Doctoral degrees in history were awarded by your institution in 1981 and 1980?

	MA	PhD
1. 1980	1,021	530
2. 1981	910	397

48. In the spaces provided below, indicate the figures for graduate applicants and admissions for men, women, minority men, minority women, and foreign nationals for the current academic year. DO NOT INCLUDE FOREIGN NATIONALS AS A MINORITY.

	Nonminority		Minority		Foreign
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Nationals
1. Applicants	1,831	1,097	175	100	446
2. Invited to enroll	1,016	815	174	78	200
3. Actually enrolled	849	628	140	65	151

49. For each category listed below, indicate the number of Masters/ Doctoral students in your department who received funding for the current academic year. FUNDING MEANS SUPPORT BEYOND THE STUDENT'S PERSONAL RESOURCES. DO NOT INCLUDE FOREIGN NATIONALS AS MINORITY.

	Nonminority		Minority		Foreign
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Nationals
1. Masters Program	562	390	60	46	53
2. Doctoral Program	531	381	70	29	80

50. Please indicate how many graduate students enrolled in your department received support from these sources of funding during the current academic year.

	N
1. Teaching assistantship (or equivalent) from the university	1789
2. Fellowship or research assistantship from the university	640
3. Foundation fellowship or research grant from a private agency	113
4. Fellowship or research grant from a local or state public agency	37
5. NDEA	15
5. HEW	1
7. NEH	9
8. Fulbright-Hays	34
9. Other (Specify):_____	68
10. Fellowship or research grant from outside the United States	38

51. Of the people awarded MA* or PhD's by your department during the past 5 years, please make estimates (or provide data if available) regarding their fields of employment.

Percentage employed by:	PhD
1. Universities/colleges	57
2. Government agencies	8
3. Nonprofit organization	8
4. Business and industry	9
5. Other	9
6. Unemployed	9

*MA percentage cannot be correctly determined because of averaging errors in survey responses.

52. Would you say that the placement or career counseling service which your department provides for graduate students emphasizes academic careers almost totally, gives significant emphasis to nonacademic careers, or emphasizes mostly nonacademic careers?

	%	N
1. mostly academic	30.0	51
2. academic and nonacademic	62.3	106
3. mostly nonacademic	7.6	13

APPENDIX

The Departmental Survey as a Data-Gathering Tool for Professional Associations

A report prepared for the American Historical Association and funded by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities.

Kristi Andersen
Polimetrics Laboratory
Department of Political Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210

I. INTRODUCTION

A well-designed and competently analyzed survey of departments can provide a professional ssociation, as well as chairpersons and others to whom the results are disseminated, with useful information about important characteristics of departments (and of the discipline as a whole). These characteristics include such things as salary and benefit structures, faculty attributes, the distribution of fields and specialties among faculty and students, and patterns of research funding. If such a survey is carried out over a number of years, an invaluable data base can be created which can provide information on patterns of change and stability in departmental characteristics.

This report draws on the experience we in the Polimetrics Laboratory have had working with the American Political Science Association and the American Historical Association in designing, processing and analyzing their departmental surveys, as well as on some examination of other similar surveys. It is designed to aid professional associations who may wish to adopt this method to aid in their data-gathering and policy-making endeavors.

The next section raises some general points to be considered in designing this type of survey. The subsequent sections describe in more detail particular substantive areas, providing examples of questions which might be asked in each area. The final two sections deal with data processing and analysis.

II. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Response rate

The major problem with mail surveys is the low response rate they usually produce. In the survey research literature, mail surveys are commonly described as having return rates of 10% - 50%, depending on such factors as the nature of the target population and the subject of the survey.

Several things can be done to increase survey response rates:

* identify (by name if possible) the individual to whom the survey should be sent (e.g., department chair)
* make the survey as short and as easy to answer as possible
* include a persuasive cover letter which describes why the data to be collected are useful and important
* include a postage-paid return envelope
* avoid mailing surveys during summer breaks, near holidays, etc.
* establish a reasonable but not too distant deadline for the return of the survey: about two weeks from estimated time of receipt is about right
* send a follow-up letter (ideally including another copy of the survey) several weeks after the first mailing to non-respondents

Of course the primary reason we worry about a low response rate is the possibility that the self-selected sample is not representative of all departments. There are several analysis

strategies which can at least partially cope with this problem; these are discussed in section V.

Instructions

Instructions as to how to answer the survey should be unambiguous. Respondents should be told to circle numbers or letters, mark x's, or whatever is appropriate. If numbers (e.g., salaries or research dollars) are to be rounded, specify how. If some questions are only applicable to certain categories of departments (e.g., Ph.D.-granting), state this clearly. Boxes, boldface type and other graphics are often useful for clarifying instructions. In general, assume confusion: we have found that political scientists and historians are as adept as many other groups at ignoring or misunderstanding instructions.

Questionnaire design

It often seems as if the most difficult thing about designing questionnaires is limiting them. Given the incentives which exist to produce a brief survey, it is critical for the people designing the survey to have a clear idea of precisely what they want or need to know.

Usually these needs fall into several categories, and it may be wise to break the questionnaire explicitly into these categories. This clarifies the instructions for the respondent, and incidentally may also allow the department chairperson to give certain sections of the survey to others (e.g., administrative assistants) to complete.

Item construction

Common sense dictates that questions be worded clearly, have unambiguous referents, and not be "double-barreled." An example of the latter is the following:

> Does your department have a graduate affairs committee as well as an undergraduate affairs committee? (Yes/No)

Test questions by having several people read them. Make sure these people all have a similar understanding of the meaning of each question.

A departmental survey will probably contain questions which allow for three different types of response: closed-ended; open-ended; and "fill in the blanks."

1. When constructing closed-ended questionnaire items, where respondents are to be given a fixed set of response alternatives, these alternatives must be mutually exclusive and collectively exhaustive. The latter criteria is the more difficult to meet, and you should consider, for each question, whether an "other" response is appropriate. In general, try to imagine a range of possible responses and allow for them. What if a chairperson's response is "I don't know", or "we don't have any of those", or "that's not applicable"?

2. Open-ended questions are those where the respondent is asked to respond in his or her own words. Such responses can be time-consuming and expensive to process and analyze (see section V), but can often provide valuable information. In

general, if responses to a particular question are likely to vary only a little from one respondent to another, a closed-ended question may be more appropriate. If, however, you are interested in a range of possible (and unpredictable) responses, or the issues about which you are concerned demand more than a one- or two-word answer, consider using an open-ended question.

3. "Fill-in-the-blank" questions usually ask for numbers: how many students, how many staff, how many courses, salary ranges, etc. Sufficient space should be allowed and rounding or estimating conventions should be stated explicitly (what if a department shares clerical staff with other departments and has 1.5 staff members?)

Don't Know/Inapplicable

On opinion surveys of the mass public, providing a non-threatening opportunity to say "I don't know" is critically important. There will be fewer opportunities in a departmental survey for "legitimate" don't knows, but each questions should be considered and, where appropriate, respondents should be allowed to say or check "don't know."

More common will be the non-applicability of many questions. Where it seems at all possible that some respondents will not be able to provide an answer for the question, a "not applicable" category should be provided.

A uniform convention should be adopted for coding these responses. A common one is "8" for don't know and "9" for not applicable.

III. DEPARTMENTAL DATA

Much of the data collected in surveys such as those conducted by the American Historical Association consist of departmental-level descriptors: questions ask for characteristics, rules, procedures and other attributes of departments. Other data (to be discussed in Section IV) refer to individual faculty members.

Academic departments exist in a wide variety of institutional contexts. Comparing a two-member department at a small, liberal-arts college to a 40-member graduate department at a state university is, for many purposes, not particularly meaningful. Thus you will probably want to include questions which will provide data to allow you to categorize departments along various size, organizational, and programmatic dimensions.

For example, the following are questions from the AHA 1981-82 survey which could be used to array departments along various dimensions or to create groups of similar departments for analysis:

> Is your college/university state, county, municipal, private, or mixed?
>
> 1. State
> 2. County
> 3. Municipal
> 4. Private
> 5. Mixed: public and private
>
> What is the approximate total full-time enrollment of your institution for the current academic year?
>
> 1. under 2500
> 2. 2500-5000
> 3. 5001-9999
> 4. 10,000-14,999
> 5. 15,000-19,999
> 6. more than 20,000

Is the history program at your insitution a separate department, or is it part of a joint department or division?

1. separate
2. joint
3. other (specify):

Does your institution presently grant the following degrees in history? (Please answer "yes" or "no" for each.)

A.A.
B.A./B.S.
M.A./M.A.T.
Ph.D.

Salaries and Benefits

One area which may be of interest here is the relative amount of money which various departments budget for different expenses. This can be identified in terms of absolute amounts:

What has been the dollar amount budgeted for your department during the current year for the following categories? (Faculty salaries, administrative/clerical salaries, graduate student support, travel, equipment, other)

This question could also be asked in percentage terms, although you should remember that percentages can always be constructed from dollar figures, while the reverse is not true.

Other areas of interest may be the amount and type of recent salary increases; again, "average increase" can be defined in percentage or absolute terms. In terms of benefits, the best way of ascertaining what types of extra-salary benefits faculty members receive is to include an exhaustive list of possibilities and to have respondents check "yes" or "no" for each one. You may also want to include a question, as AHA has done, as to what percentage of base salary benefits typically comprise.

You may also be interested in the process by which salary or benefit increases are agreed upon. Here are some examples of questions:

> How are faculty salaries, work loads, and support levels negotiated at your college/university?
> 1. Negotiations between department head and higher administration
> 2. Faculty union collective bargaining
> 3. Combination of these
> 4. Other (specify):
>
> Do you anticipate a change in the method of negotiation concerning salaries, work loads, and support levels at your institution in the next two years?
> 1. Yes (please specify):
> 2. No

Instructional & Research Support

One area of perennial interest is how faculty members spend their time (as between research, teaching, administration and so forth) and, related to this, how much and what kinds of support they receive for these various activities.

A departmental survey can ask a chairperson to estimate the percentage of time a "typical" faculty member spends in various activities, but the results are likely to be of questionable validity: he or she may simply not have this knowledge, or be a bad estimator, or view as "typical" someone who is not.

More precise data can be obtained on course loads, amount and source of research funding, number of teaching assistants, and so forth. Some examples follow:

> Does your institution ever provide funds for travel to professional meetings?
> 1. Yes
> 2. No

Which one of the following policies for paid leaves most accurately corresponds to the conditions applicable to your department faculty?

1. Leave available only upon approval of a proposal
2. No specific proposal required for leave (traditional sabbatical)
3. Uncertain availability in a given case; awards are competitive; total numbers of awards are limited
4. No paid leaves

Indicate the approximate total amount of funds from all sources for research and/or professional improvement received by your faculty during the current academic year plus summer (include paid leaves/sabbaticals).

Indicate which (if any) of the sources listed below provide funds for research or professional improvement by your faculty during the current academic year plus summer. (Circle "yes" or "no" for each source.)

College or university
Local/state private agency
Local/state public agency
Foreign source (public or private)
Federal agency or agencies (specify)
National private foundation(specify)

Personnel Changes

Clearly questions on this subject are of great interest, since they hold the possibility of being able to identify where job opportunities (or non-opportunities) are. One should keep in mind, however, that the returned surveys will provide only a sample (and not necessarily a representative one at that) of the departments in the discipline. Hence caution is called for in making inferences about where changes are taking place.

There are several questions which can be used to develop a general picture of a department's personnel situation:

How many full-time faculty can be expected to retire in the four years following the current academic year?

Indicate the number of full-time faculty who left the department during the current academic year, or who will have left at the end of the current academic year, for the reasons listed below.

Denied tenure
Appointment not renewed
Voluntary resignation
Retirement
Deceased

For each of the categories listed below, indicate the number of full-time faculty hired at the start of the current academic year.

To fill new tenured or tenure track positions
To fill existing tenure track positions
To fill a temporary position
To fill a non-tenure track position

Indicate the number of full-time faculty you have hired or expect to hire for the next academic year (same categories as above).

It would also be possible to break down these projections by field or area of specialization.

Enrollment and Curriculum

Basic information in this area relates to requirements, numbers, and types of courses offered. Thus questions such as the following might be asked:

Indicate the number of undergraduate majors enrolled in your history program and the approximate number of undergraduate degrees in history to be awarded for the current academic year.

What was the total enrollment in September 198x in all history courses?

In order to graduate from your institution, must an undergraduate take at least one history course?

Please indicate the number of different course offerings in your history program by fields. Count a 2-semester course as 2 courses, a 3-quarter course as 3 courses.

In the preceding questions, the decision about what fields to include is a difficult one, and should be reached only after consultation with several different people currently teaching in the discipline.

In order to get a general idea of the kinds of changes which characterize programs and courses, the American Historical Association asked, in addition, an open-ended question about programmatic changes:

> If your department has definite plans to eliminate or to expand areas of study or programs in the next two or three years, please describe these plans (briefly) below.

Department Administration

Questions on this subject will probably be few in number and could, in fact, be subsumed under another category. Items on the American Historical Association departmental surveys have included the following:

> How many members of your history faculty are devoting half-time of more to administrative duties in the department or in the college/university as a part of their formal workload during the current accademic year?
>
> What kind of appointment does the department chair hold?
> 1. rotating
> 2. one year
> 3. two year
> 4. three years or more
> 5. indefinite
>
> How is the department chair compensated for administrative duties?
> 1. extra salary
> 2. course load reduction
> 3. no compensation
> 4. other (specify):

Graduate Programs and Placement

If information is desired which applies only to departments with graduate programs, a specific section should be clearly designated for these questions.

Areas of possible interest center on the distribution of graduate students by area of specialization; changes in enrollments and degrees granted; rates of application and acceptance; sources of funding; and fields of employment of graduates.

Questions of numbers (how many applicants, degrees, etc.) can be fairly straightforward. Once again, items which ask respondents to categorize courses (or, in this case, students) according to fields or specialties should be carefully constructed to represent adequately the most common set of specializations within the discipline (while still leaving the opportunity for reports of "other" fields).

The questions about number of degrees awarded, number of applicants, enrollees, and so forth can, if desired, be broken down by race, sex, or other categories.

IV. INDIVIDUAL DATA

It may or may not be necessary or useful, for any particular organization, to collect data at the individual level as well as at the departmental level. The information discussed thus far in this report has applied to departments as entities; reference may be made to "typical" or "average" faculty members to obtain the respondents judgments about modal departmental characteristics, but for the most part individuals are not the focus.

If comparisons between men and women, between tenured and nontenured faculty, between minority and non-minority faculty, to give a few examples, will be or should be part of your analysis, obtaining individual-level data will be necessary. Names, of course, should not be used. The American Historical Association has asked department chairs to supply, for each faculty member, the following data:

* status (full-time or part-time)
* rank (professor, associate professor, assistant professor, instructor or lecturer)
* tenured status (tenured, non-tenured, non-tenure track)
* sex (male or female)
* ethnicity (Asian American, Black American, Hispanic-American, Indian/Native American, Non-Minority, Foreign National)
* salary (can be categorized in any number of ways)
* primary source of income (this position or "other")
* number of years at current rank

* number of years at current institution
* present age
* year received Ph.D.
* year received M.A.

Respondents were asked to fill this information in on a matrix, where each value of the above variables was given a particular code (full-time was "1", part-time was "2" and so forth).

V. DATA PROCESSING AND ANALYSIS

Designing for Data Processing

There are several things which can be done in the initial design stages to save time, effort and money at the processing and analysis stage.

First, let us assume that the data collected in the form of survey responses will be either punched on cards or into a computer via terminals. The difficult and costly way to do this is to have all the data transferred to coding sheets after the surveys have been returned, and then punched or entered at the terminal. If the survey is designed well, however, this step can be eliminated. More specifically, instructions which will be sufficient to tell data entry people what and where to put information from the survey can be printed on the questionnaire itself, so that data can be entered directly.

In order to do this, each variable (question) is given a particular width and a particular location. Let us assume card data for the moment. If the first question on a survey is one on university enrollment, and this is a closed-ended question allowing the respondent to choose from six different responses, which are coded 1 through 6, then this question is a one-column variable. Let us say that the identification number (see below) has four digits (a four-column variable). Then the identification number will be punched in columns 1-4 of the first card, and the enrollment variable will be punched in column 5.

There are numerous conventions for putting the width and location information on the survey itself. We usually put the information to the left of the question in the following manner:

19/1:27 8. Does your department use a clerical pool or do you have your own staff?
1. use clerical pool
2. have own staff

Here, "19" is the variable number, "1" denotes the first card, and "27" refers to the column. If this was a two column variable, the information would be "19/1:27-28". Many survey organizations put this information on the right, sometimes separated from the body of the survey by lines or boxes. All of these conventions achieve the same purpose.

If open-ended questions are included and will be coded, one must decide how much room to leave. If the question is likely to be one where only a few different answers will be given or where the analyst is only interested in making one major distinction, it may be safe to leave only one column. In general, however, you may want to hedge your bets and leave at least two columns.

It is probably best to use numbers rather than letters as response labels. Some statistical packages can deal with the former more easily, and most keypunchers seem to find it easier to punch numbers. This, of course, would dictate tagging response categories with "1", "2" and "3" rather than "a", "b" and "c" unless there is good reason not to.

Identification

Each survey should have a unique identification number. The easiest way to do this is to append this number, in a designated spot such as the upper right-hand corner, as the surveys are returned, preferably with a continuous number-stamping machine, or by hand. The identification number will be a variable, for purposes of analysis, so space should be left for this number to be punched or entered. Identification numbers for 354 surveys (presuming you did not send out more than 999) would run from "001" to "354".

Coding

There are actually at least three tasks to be accomplished under the general rubric of "coding":

Most important, open-ended responses have to be provided with numbers. The first step in this is to devise a "coding frame" Take a decent sample of returned surveys and see what the responses look like. If, for example, a question had inquired (as one on the AHA survey did) with what disciplines history formed a joint department (in those cases where history was not a separate department), a quick look through the surveys might indicate that the most common were Sociology, Economics, Political Science, and Geography. A more systematic search might turn up Philosophy, Psychology, English, Communications, etc. A decision which has to be made here is the level of precision you wish to achieve. If what you are really after is whether History

is tied up with social sciences, humanities, or "other," give all "social science" responses (after deciding what consitutes social science) a "1", all "humanities" responses a "2" and so on. It is likely, however, that you want to preserve a bit more information than this, so you may give most of the disciplines mentioned above their own number (1 for Political Science, 2 for Sociology, 3 for Economics, and so on), perhaps lumping Art, Criminal Justice, and others for which there seem to be few respondents all into one "other" category. One thing to remember is that you can always create large categories from your small categories, but you cannot move in the other direction: once you have decided to categorize all social sciences together, you cannot retrieve the distinction between Economics and Sociology without a lot of work.

The second coding task is to be sure that respondents have filled in the blanks correctly. This should be done with the knowledge that all columns must have numbers (or letters, or some other symbols) in them for purposes of keypunching. Thus, for example, "leading zeros" should be filled as in the following case: You have asked for a faculty member's "years in current rank" and provided two columns. A "2" is written in. The coder should put a zero in front of the 2 so that the value is "02". (Note: this particular coding task may not have to be performed, depending on the program you will use for analysis.)

Third, the coders should be instructed to make sure that there is a response to every question, and to provide a "missing"

response if there is not -- for example if a respondent has inadvertently failed to answer a question. In general, coders should be carefully trained, provided with detailed written instructions, and supervised.

Keypunching or data entry

If the initial design has been foresighted and the coding competent, the keypunching or data entry step should be nearly problem-free. If the data are to be keypunched, they should, if possible, be verified (on a verifier) as well.

Analysis

Analysis will probably be done via one of the widely- used canned programs such as SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) or SAS (Statistical Analysis System). Both systems have their advantages and their proponents, and your choice will, in any case, probably be dictated by program availability and analyst competence. Both programs allow you to build your data into a relatively permanent "file" or "data set" with, if you desire, various labels and titles attached.

The most basic type of analysis to be performed on the data is simple frequencies: the distribution of departments across the response categories for each variable. In many cases these results will be interesting in and of themselves, and they also can provide the basis for assessing the representativeness of the sample. For example, you may have external data that indicate that 50% of the departments in your disciplines have fewer than 8

full-time faculty members. If only 30% of the departments in your sample fall into this category, the sample clearly underrepresents these small departments. One way around this problem is through weighting of cases. SPSS, for example, has a procedure which allows you to give particular cases a greater or lesser weight in analysis. In the above case, you would "weight" departments with fewer FTEs. The problem with this, however, is that the analyst must choose the dimensions on which to weight, with no assurance that he or she has picked the most crucial ones, or all the ones on which the sample is unrepresentative.

Another way to overcome (at least partially) the problem of representativeness is to present frequencies within comparable subgroups of departments. How these subgroups are constructed will of course vary, but size, graduate program, and perhaps public vs. private should be taken into account. If, for example, each of these variables was dichotomized, one would have six subgroups. This way the under- or overrepresentation of one or more of these types of departments in the sample as a whole is irrelevant, and departments are being compared with others similar to themselves.

The next step, in analyzing particular questions of interest, is probably to generate joint distributions (commonly called, in "SPSS-ese", CROSSTABS) of variables. For example, is there a relationship between percent of faculty tenured and amount of research funding? Do private institutions place more emphasis on teaching? One recommendation here is to be selective in

generating such questions. It may seem temptingly easy to crosstabulate "everything by everything" but the result will be uninterpretable chaos.